

[10191/4296]

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY PAGE)**

International Application No. PCT/DE2004/001985

Re Point V.

1. Reference is made to the following documents in the present opinion:
D1: DE 101 33 384 A (BOSCH GMBH ROBERT) January 30, 2003
(2003-01-30)
D2: U.S. 6,110,354 A (SABAN STEVEN ET AL) August 29, 2000
(2000-08-29)
2. The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claim 1 is not based on an inventive step within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 is considered to be the related art closest to the subject matter of Claim 1. It discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document):
A sensor for detecting particles in a gas stream, especially soot particles in exhaust gas, having a substrate (2), a heating element (3), contactings (4, 5) and comb-type electrodes (7, 8).

Therefore, the subject matter of Claim 1 differs from that known from D1 in that the electrodes are implemented according to the preamble of Claim 1.

The objective to be achieved with the present invention can thus be seen in finding an electrode arrangement having small dimensions and distances.

The design approach proposed in Claim 1 of the present Application cannot be regarded as inventive for the following reasons (Article 33 (3) PCT):

The disadvantages of comb-type electrodes have already been discussed in D2 (column 2, lines 43-58). Therefore, the problem on which the application is based is already known from the related art disclosed in D2. The solution proposed in D2, an electrode arrangement on substrates with insulating intermediate layers (column 5, lines 39-51), anticipates the solution indicated in Claim 1 of the present patent application.

Therefore, one skilled in the art would combine all features disclosed in D1 and D2 to achieve the objective set without an inventive step. The design approach proposed in independent Claim 1 can therefore not be regarded as inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

3. The methods claimed in Claims 9 and 10 seem to relate to method steps customary in the art, which one skilled in the art who is familiar with the sensor to be produced would carry out without inventive activity (Article 33 (3) PCT).
4. The dependent claims appear to contain no features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, meet the requirements for inventive activity, since they are known from documents D1 and D2.